



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/652,978	08/31/2000	Stephen McFarland	02950.P059	4737

7590 08/05/2003

Jeffrey S. Smith
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
7th Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025

EXAMINER

KNOWLIN, THJUAN P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2642

DATE MAILED: 08/05/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/652,978

Applicant(s)

MCFARLAND ET AL.

Examiner

Thjuan P Knowlin

Art Unit

2642

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

THE REPLY FILED 22 July 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. **ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).**

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on . Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☒ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Attachment (Response to Arguments).

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): .
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: .
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: NONE.

Claim(s) objected to: NONE.

Claim(s) rejected: 25-39.


Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: NONE.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). .
10. ☐ Other:

Examiner: Thjuan P. Knowlin
Phone: (703) 308-1727

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed July 22, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant states: that in Eslambolchi, the preference of the calling party is not information associated with a called party much less information associated with a second called party; Eslambolchi does not describe treating a first called party "differently" from a second called party based on information associated with the second called party; and the preference of the called party is not information associated with a second called party, but rather, information associated with the called party because it is the preference of the called party. Examiner respectfully disagrees with these arguments. Claim 25 is still very broad. It can be read as meaning, when there is a multiple of called parties, and all called parties speak English and one speaks French, then that one caller will be treated "differently". However, Eslambolchi, does teach treating at least one called party "differently" from the second called party based on information associated with multiple called parties (col. 3 lines 32-41). Col. 3 lines 32-41, discloses the calls made to an area where the primary residents speak Spanish, would be communicated in that language, unless the called party has noted the desire or need for the call to be made in English, French, etc. Applicant has also changed the limitation of "at least one" to "the first", and the limitations of "multiple called parties" and "other called parties" to "the second called party." These limitations change the scope of the claims, therefore requiring further consideration and/or search by the Examiner.


AHMAD MATAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600